

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 9-18 stand rejected. In the present Amendment, claims 9 and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced into the present application by any of the amendments. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Applicants note with appreciation the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101, 102(b) and (e).

The rejection of claims 9-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully traversed. However, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection has been rendered moot by the amendments to the claims.

The rejection of claims 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Sabatier is respectfully traversed. Sabatier does not disclose the invention of the present claims. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider this rejection in view of the amendments to the claims.

The rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sabatier is respectfully traversed. Sabatier does not disclose or suggest the invention of the present claims (including claim 16). It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider this rejection in view of the amendments to the claims.

The rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sabatier as applied to claim 16, and further in view of Turner, is respectfully traversed. Sabatier does not disclose or suggest the invention of the present claims (including claim 12). Turner is not properly combinable with Sabatier (no motivation to combine these references). It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider this rejection in view of the amendments

to the claims and the above remarks.

The rejection of claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sabatier as applied to claim 16, and further in view of Bio-Red Labs, is respectfully traversed. Sabatier does not disclose or suggest the invention of the present claims (including claims 17 and 18). The Bio-Red Labs document is not properly combinable with Sabatier (no motivation to combine these documents). It is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider this rejection in view of the amendments to the claims and the above remarks.

The references that are cited of interest, but not applied, do not teach or suggest the invention of the present claims.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the present claims (i.e., claims 9-18) are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, issuance of a Notice of Allowability for claims 9-18 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE AND HUTZ LLP

By

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
William E. McShane  
Reg. No. 32,707  
Tele.: (302) 658-9141